

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	LICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/784,094		02/16/2001	Roger Pellenc	P20520 3219		
7055	7590	01/08/2003				
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.				EXAMINER		
1941 ROLA RESTON, Y	·	RKE PLACE		MAMMEN, NATHAN SCOTT		
				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				3671		
				DATE MAILED: 01/08/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

· •	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
. Advisory Action	09/784,094	PELLENC ET AL.	\/
Auvisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
v	Nathan S Mammen	3671	P
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 26 December 2002 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to available rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application application abandonment of this application abandment which are the same of th	ation. A proper reply n places the applica	y to a ition in
	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of the under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Officimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Officimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment.	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing SFILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejecting FINAL REJECTION. R 1.136(a) and the apprount of the fee. The appropriationally set in the final	on. See MPEP opriate extension opriate extension Office action; or
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's . 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be 	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal o		
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further		see NOTF below):	
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b		300 110 12 00,011),	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	,	rially reducing or sir	mplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceli	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claim	S.
NOTE:			
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	ion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: Se		dered but does NO	T place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bec raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disapp	roved by the Exami	ner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	-	
10. Other:			
_			

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: while the examiner did agree to reconsider the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, the request for reconsideration fails to address the substance of the rejection. Applicant misconstrues the substance of the interview between Applicant and examiner: the examiner's position was that the claims are so void of clear and specific limitations such that the van der Lely '519 patent reads on the instant invention. Applicant is improperly attempting to read limitations of the specification into the claims.

Thomas B. Will Supervisory Patent Examiner Group 3600